DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 854 95 IR 005 313

AUTHOR	Weaver, Barbara F.
TITLE	CLASP (Central Mass. Library Administration Simulation Project) July 1, 1974-June 30, 1976. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Worcester Public Library, Mass.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	38p.; For related document, see ED 116 686 ; Best copy available
AVAILABLE FROM	Librarian Game, Harwell Associates, Pinnacle Road, Harvard, MA 01451
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Games; Inservice Education; *Librarians; Library Administration; *Library Education; Library Role; *Program Budgeting; Program Evaluation; *Program Planning; Public Libraries; School Libraries; *Simulation
IDENTIFIERS	*Planning Programming Budgeting System

ABSTRACT

This is the second and final year report on the CLASP (Central Massachusetts Library Administration Simulation Project) which developed and tested a simulation model that would enable library personnel to learn and practice skills of negotiation, decision making, budgeting, and program planning. Specific program objectives were: (1) to upgrade the content and quality of continuing education curricula; (2) to improve the ability of library administrators to meet community demands; and (3) to develop a workshop model that would provide learning opportunities to librarians in the program planning and budgeting process. A subsidiary set of behavioral objectives was also developed for workshop participants. Unlike the first year when the model was tested only with public librarians, the second year testing also included library students and academic and special librarians. Evaluation of the project showed that the project goals were met. Simulation was most effective for those participants who had a real need to learn about PPBS, and who had a real situation in which to apply their learning. A list of advisory committee members and project staff, second year workshop participants, participant questionnaire used for the pre-and post-test, and evaluation reports for both years of the project are appended. (Author/JPF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145854

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

F I N A L R E P O R T

C L A S P

(Central Mass. Library Administration Simulation Project)

July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1976

Funded under Title II-B

Higher Education Act of 1965

Barbara F. Weaver, Project Director

Central Mass. Regional Library System

Worcester Public Library

Worcester, MA 01608

IR005 313

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Statement of Needs	5
Project Objectives	6
Plan of Operation	7
Operation of the Model	11
Evaluation of Project	13
Appendix A - Advisory Committees and Project Staff	17
B - Participants: Workshop at Mt. Wachusett Community College, Spring 1975	18
C - Participants: Workshop at Northborough Free Library, January 1976	19
D - Participants: Workshop for Worcester Area Cooperating Libraries	20
E - Participant Questionnaire	21
F - Evaluators' Report - First-Year Program	22
G - Evaluators' Report - Second-Year Program	32
H - The Librarians' Game	40

CLASP (Central Mass. Library Administration Simulation Project) was a research project intended to develop and test a simulation model which would enable library personnel to learn and practice skills of negotiation, decision-making, budgeting and program planning. The model under development was based on preliminary work done in 1972 as a small part of a Federal grant under Title II-B of the Higher Education Act. The earlier model was intended for use only in an academic environment and required considerable development and modification to make it suitable for use by practicing librarians.

STATEMENT OF NEEDS

Professional librarians are confronted by a widening range of demands for library services in the communities they serve. Although there are basic services common to large urban and small rural libraries, there is a set of unique demands as well as opportunities for which the modern librarian must be prepared.

A subset of these demands emanates directly from the character of the community in which the library is located and often is met with frustration due to a lack of managerial or administrative experience to turn these challenges into opportunities effectively. Librarians accustomed to dealing with a middle-class, educated clientele for example, are forced into difficult positions when required to decide on priorities when faced with an influx of minority groups, the urban poor, or any similar large-scale change in the community.

In performance of administrative duties the selection of the annual program and budget to reflect and respond to these demands is a crucial and significant process. It is during this process that an awareness of both the community and the administrative system become essential. All too frequently the training programs for librarians, particularly in the more rural areas, have been insufficient to develop this awareness in librarian prior to their being faced with administrative responsibilities of this scope directly on the job. Moreover, a recurring problem for educators, including those in continuing education programs for librarians, is a lack of pedagogical tools, models and curricula to address these challenges satisfactorily.

Among the tools available are those of planning, programming and budgeting as applied to library administration. The application of PPBS has already demonstrated its effectiveness; it can readily serve as a basis for innovative curriculum approaches. It is an underlying thesis of this project that there is substantial promise for the development of an integrative model of library service in the community based on PPBS. Among the many advantages inherent in the simulation approach are the facts that an educational model of this type can:

by simplifying the complex administrative and social systems with which the librarian is faced promote greater understanding of these systems and their elements;

provide an opportunity for librarians to "learn-by-doing" by addressing issues and daily conflict and by testing alternative responses in a low-risk situation; and

exploit role-playing simulation's uniqueness as an enjoyable medium for continuing education.

Initially the project was to have been completed in one year; however, as the model development took place, it became obvious that additional testing and refinement would be necessary. Therefore, second-year funding was sought and obtained to test the model in different settings and with persons of differing library experience and training. Workshop activities during the first year consisted of a single four-day series conducted for member librarians of the Central Mass. Regional Library System. A detailed report of this portion of the project was provided to HEW under the title "Program Planning is the Name of the Game" and has been published as ERIC Document Number ED116 686. Because it seemed likely that potential users of the simulation might balk at the requirement of a four-day time span, attempts during the second year were made to simplify some of the steps - yet without eliminating any important factors - so as to speed up the game.

Three separate groups participated in the testing of the model during the second year. The first, a group of public librarians in Massachusetts (but outside of Central Mass. Region) participated in a one-day workshop in January 1976. The second group, library science students in an Adult Services course at Simmons College School of Library Science, participated in a series of four 2½-hour class sessions held at weekly intervals. The third group consisted of librarians from academic and other libraries that make up the Worcester Area Cooperating Libraries. This last group also met for a single all-day session.

An advisory committee made up of representatives of all the types of libraries and communities involved in the simulation gave much valuable advice and help during the project. Appendix A lists the members of the advisory committee for each of the two years of the project, as well as project staff.

Throughout the project information releases were distributed to the library and local press, with excellent response. In addition, demonstrations of the simulation were arranged for at the Fall Conference of the New England Library Association in October 1975, at a session of the WICHE/ USOE Institute for Training in Staff Development in Boulder, Colorado in November 1975, at ALA Midwinter, and at the first CLENE Assembly in Chicago in January 1976. Also at a Conference of the North American Simulation and Gaming Association in Los Angeles in October 1975.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project had a two-fold thrust in that it was a research project intended to develop a usable product, and in that the product itself had to be designed to accomplish certain ends. For this reason, the project staff developed a set of objectives for the overall project, with a subsidiary set of behavioral objectives to be achieved by participants experiencing the model in a workshop setting. The Advisory Committee was asked to respond to these objectives and refine or change them in the light of their own experiences and felt needs.

Program objectives as finally approved for the first year were as follows:

1. To improve the ability of library administrators to meet community demands.

2. To upgrade the content and quality of continuing education curricula.

3. To develop a workshop model that will provide learning opportunities to librarians in the area of program planning and budgeting.

Objectives #2 and #3 were concerned with the development of the model, whereas objective #1 related to the effectiveness of the model. Therefore, the behavioral objectives developed related primarily to objective #1, which concerns the kinds of learning that would result from use of the model. These objectives were stated as follows:

As a result of the workshop participants will

1. have some experience in how a program budget is developed
2. be able to list some elements involved in decision-making
3. be able to describe how some components of a community influence budgetary decisions
4. have learned some skills of negotiation, compromise, and collaboration, including trade-offs (the political process)
5. be able to describe the elements of program planning

For the second year an additional program goal and several program objectives were added to the above as follows:

Goal: To develop a simulation that can be packaged for use as an educational tool by public and academic libraries and library schools, to improve skills of program planning and budgeting.

Objectives: To refine and condense the existing model

To adapt the model to other (academic and library school) environments

To test the model in three different environments for its adaptability and ease of use

To test the level of instruction that needs to be given potential users of the model

To assess the degree of nationwice interest in using a simulation format for learning about program planning and budgeting.

PLAN OF OPERATION

The project plan called for the project director and model developer to meet with the Advisory Committee on a regular basis to make sure that the model would in fact reflect current conditions and situations encountered in libraries. In addition the evaluation team met with the project director and model developer from the beginning to clarify objectives and establish methods.

Listing of scheduled events appears below:

Date	Event	Purpose
First Year Program		
September 9, 1974	Meeting of Project Director and Evaluators (Project Staff)	To acquaint evaluators with project parameters and establish time table.

Date	Event	Purpose
First Year Program (continued)		
October 3, 1974	Advisory Committee Mtg.	To set project objectives, define issues facing communities in Region, and establish criteria for participant selection.
January 19, 1975	Meeting of Project Staff	To decide on project aspects to be evaluated, and set evaluation means
January 30, 1975	Advisory Committee Mtg.	To report project progress, to firm up participant criteria, and to recommend workshop dates and locations
March 24, 25, 31 April 1, 1975	Workshop Sessions	To test model
April 15, 1975	Meeting of Project Staff	To debrief workshop sessions, to provide evaluators with staff reactions to sessions, to decide on next steps
May 20, 1975	Advisory Committee Mtg.	To report on project achievements and to make recommendations for possible future actions
Second Year Program		
July 31, 1975	Mtg. of Project Staff and Evaluators	To set up evaluation measures for the second year
September 12, 1975	Advisory Committee Mtg.	To develop specific objectives for the second-year project, and to acquaint the model developer with issues facing libraries other than public libraries.
October 3, 1975	Mtg. with A.J. Anderson, Simmons College Faculty	To investigate the possibility of testing the model with library science students
October 5, 1975	Mtg. of Representatives of WACL - Worcester Public Library	To acquire information concerning possible participants from WACL member libraries, and to determine what specific concerns these people might have
January 26, 1976	Massachusetts Public Librarians Workshop - Northboro Public Library	To test the model with public librarians outside of Central Mass.
February 13, 20, 27 March 5, 1976	Simmons College Library School Students - Workshop	To test the model with library science students

Date	Event	Purpose
Second Year Program (continued)		
May 18, 1976	Worcester Area Cooperating Libraries Workshop - Worcester State College	To test the model with academic and special libraries
June 15, 1976	Mtg. with Program Participants Interested in running a workshop themselves - Auburn Public Library	To train libraries in the elements of conducting the simulation

The Advisory Committee at its initial meeting was asked to develop criteria for selection of participants in what was then expected to be the only workshop series. Criteria suggested included:

> interest, willingness to attend, possibility of participant teams to include perhaps the librarian and a trustee, consideration of present access to continuing education activities, and the necessity of proving interaction between small and large libraries.

The Advisory Committee meeting on January 30, 1975 provided further data for criteria for participants. The group felt that an ideal mix would be about one-third of the participants from the staffs of the larger libraries, one-third from communities between 10,000 to 35,000 and one-third from small towns. Those persons who would be interested, according to the group, would be members of the Central Regional Advisory Council, non-administrative staff in large libraries, head librarians and perhaps other staff in medium-sized libraries, librarians in small libraries and trustees from any sized library. The group felt it was unreasonable to expect that anyone less connected with libraries would want to attend, partly because of the specialized subject of the workshops, and partly because of the large time commitment required. Constraints on attendance were felt to be lack of supportive staff to cover for people in small libraries, difficulty of getting away, and the like. Letters of invitation were, however, sent to all libraries that are members of the Regional System.

The actual list of participants in the first workshop series included 14% from Worcester, the largest city in the region, 33% from communities from 10,000 - 35,000 population and 52% of the participants from communities under 10,000 population. Of this last figure, 33% of the participants came from communities of 5,000 or less. Since most the communities which belong to the Central Mass. Regional Library System are small, the population of the workshop reflected the library population of the region. Appendix B lists the project participants.

Mount Wachusett Community College in Gardner was chosen as the workshop site, in order to insure maximum participation by librarians from the northern part of the Region, which tends to have smaller communities and thus more libraries operating with a single, part time librarian. Gardner is within easy driving distance of most of the smaller towns. The college also is in a new facility having just been completed during the last year. The college officials were most cooperative and helpful, giving the project a large meeting room with ample electrical outlets for video equipment and electronic calculators, plus access to cafeteria, rest rooms and copying facilities. The first two workshop sessions were held on days when the college was not in session and the cafeteria did not provide meals; therefore on these days lunches for the project were provided by a caterer. On the final two days the services of the college cafeteria were used.

For the second-year project, all members of the central Advisory Committee were asked if they were willing to continue to serve. In addition, representation was sought from other types of library interests. The new Advisory Committee met on September 12, 1975 to refine the project objectives and to assist project staff by providing information about the areas of concern in non-public libraries that should be incorporated into an expanded model. Although it was originally intended that there be three meetings of the Advisory Committee during the year, it was agreed that, because of the heavy emphasis on design modification rather than on any changes in the overall project, it would be more beneficial for project staff to meet with small groups representing the specific participant group for which the individual workshops were being designated; e.g., library science students or academic libraries. The Advisory Committee was, however, particularly concerned that the model not be abridged to the point where valuable lessons would be lost. They felt that it was important to have enough time for participants to develop some understanding of the kinds of program and budgetary problems they would be likely to encounter in real life. They also wanted to be sure that the budget justification process was retained.

Public Library Model Testing

For the testing of a one-day simulation involving public librarians, criteria for selection of participants included the following:

- all participants should have experience working in a Massachusetts (but not Central Mass.) public library

- participants should include a mix of administrators, middle-management people, and persons with no administrative experience

The actual composition of the group (see Appendix C) did reflect a variety of sizes of libraries and of kinds of experience. Among the 28 participants, there were four head librarians, six assistant directors, and two heads of children's departments, plus representatives from both the Eastern and Western Regional Library Systems as well as the Mass. Bureau of Library Extension. The site chosen was the Northborough Public Library, which had a meeting room large enough to accommodate the group and was geographically convenient for most travellers from the eastern and western parts of the state.

Library Science Students Model Testing

There were 30 students in the library science course conducted by Professor A.J. Anderson at Simmons College School of Library Science. In order to provide an opportunity to check out a maximum number of roles in the simulation, the class was divided into two groups, one playing roles of public libraries and the other roles of academic and school libraries. The groups were separated physically for most of the time, coming together only during budget negotiating or reporting times. Settings were standard classrooms at the school.

Academic Library Model Testing

Although the Worcester Area Cooperating Libraries has some 16 member libraries, only five organizations were able to send representatives to the all-day session at Worcester State College. Nevertheless, the variety of backgrounds represented provided additional valuable data for model refinement. Appendix D lists the participants in this workshop session.

Although not part of the project, demonstrations conducted during the fall and winter of 1976 at the New England Library Association's annual conference, at the Capitol Region Library Council in Hartford, Conn., and at two more library science classes at Simmons also provided information that was helpful in refining the model as finally developed.

Publicity

A factor considered of major importance in the project was the need to let interested groups and individuals know of the work being done in developing the simulation. Accordingly, at the beginning of the program a press release describing the project was sent to national library media as well as to library newsletters in New England and to local general-interest newspapers. The release was also sent to publications in the fields of adult education, and simulation and gaming. Information from the release was printed in LJ Hotline, Library Journal, Simulation/Gaming News, and in local newspapers such as the Worcester Telegram. Inquiries were received primarily from potential distributors of the proposed product, and from a couple of publishers of bibliographies on simulation games.

Several of the early workshop sessions were videotaped in the hopes that the tapes would assist potential users of the model to understand the procedure. An edited copy of the video taped material was included with the first-year report, and additional copies are available for viewing on request to the project director.

As the model developed neared its conclusion, major efforts were made to provide demonstrations and displays of the project. A two-hour session sponsored by the New England Outreach Network (NEON) Section of the New England Library Association in October 1976 attracted some 50 participants and generated requests for additional information.

The videotapes produced during the first year project was displayed at the first CLENE Assembly in Chicago in July 1975 and drew a great deal of interest, particularly from library schools and state library development agencies.

OPERATION OF THE MODEL

The model developed in this project is an extension and refinement of a model originally conceived and constructed at the Department of Library Sciences, Wayne State University in 1972.[1] The approach here has been to design a simulation game focusing on the role of librarians in six hypothetical communities ranging in size from slightly over 1,000 to 60,000 in population, and comparable in size and character to many of those in Central Massachusetts.

In the first stages of the project, the decision was made to test the refined model at a workshop series to which library administrators and middle level library staff would be invited.

[1]See Lawson, Barry R. "An Educational Simulation Model of Public Library Service", Journal of Education for Librarianship, Fall 1973, Vol. 14 no. 2 pp. 96-106.

The model and workshop formats were designed to fit into four daily sessions, each session representing one year in the administration of a hypothetical library and the regional system to which it belonged. In the workshop the twenty-one participants (See Appendix B) were assigned roles, principally as librarians (three staff to each of the six libraries; three as staff to the regional library system), but also as representatives to the regional system and members of finance committees. Each day all participants rotated roles within his/her library throughout the workshop. Therefore, each of the eighteen people in the six municipal libraries had at least one opportunity to be responsible for budget preparation and justification (head librarian), for participation in regional system program development (regional system representative), and for final budget decision-making (finance committee member).

During each "year" participants took part in a series of programmed activities. These activities will not be described here in detail, since the model has changed significantly from the beginning; however, they are described in the first-year report. [2]

The final format of the model includes a variety of possible roles, including public libraries, academic libraries, and a regional school system, as well as individual roles of regional system coordinator, state and federal agency representatives. The game administrator can choose to use any or all the possible roles, depending on desired learning outcomes, available times, and number of participants. An advantage to the present design is that it is possible to play the game with one person in each role or with several people assigned to a single role. In the latter case, group decision-making becomes an additional factor in play.

In the final design, it is also possible to vary the length of the workshop to emphasize only certain aspects of the program planning and budgeting process. In general, however, a typical one-day simulation exercise would probably be scheduled somewhat as follows:

A. Introduction to Workshop (15 Minutes)
   1. Explain purpose of The Librarian's Game
   2. Assign roles and seats

B. Preview Steps in Play (30 Minutes)
   1. Read steps aloud as printed
   2. Answer questions about gaming model
   3. Permit participants to preview material

C. Prepare Program for Round One (15 Minutes)
   1. Review given budget
   2. Select program(s)
   3. Indicate selections on budget sheet

D. Client Demand/ Response; each role: (60 Minutes)
   1. Select one demand sheet
   2. Place sheet beneath Program Attendance and Use Sheet
   3. Read demands/make responses

Optional: For a 2½ hour session, go directly to L.

[2] See "Program Planning is the Name of the Game" ERIC Document No. ED 116 686.

E. Regional System Meeting (chaired by regional administrator) (30 Minutes)
   1. Review budget available for regional programs
   2. Discuss alternative programs
   3. Select programs/other decisions

F. Lunch (or break) and Evaluation of Round One (45 Minutes)

G. Budget Preparation for Round Two and Proposals for State/Federal (30 Min.) Grants

H. Budget Justification (30 Minutes)

I. Announcements of State/Federal Grants (5 Minutes)

J. Budget Revision (5 Minutes)

K. Client Demand/Response (as in D. above) (60 Minutes)

L. Evaluation of Role Performance (30 Minutes)

M. Evaluation of Workshop (30 Minutes)

A complete copy of THE LIBRARIANS' GAME, which includes descriptions of all the roles as well as all the steps in play, is included in the report as Appendix H. The game, as finally designed, includes one copy of the administrator's manual, 30 participants' manuals, plus worksheets, and State and Federal funding request forms. The game will be available commercially to interested libraries and other agencies. It will be marketed through Harwell Associates, Harvard, Mass.

As the model developed during the first year, it appeared that there would be large amounts of arithmetical calculations required of participants. For this reason, it was planned, during the second year, to develop a simple computer program that would lift the burden of calculations from participants. As it turned out, it was possible to simplify the mathematics sufficiently so that a computer program was not necessary. It is helpful for participants to use a calculating machine, but the only functions required are basic addition, subtraction, multiplication and division.

EVALUATION OF PROJECT

A team of two evaluators was engaged to evaluate both the overall project and the effectiveness of the model as it was tested during the several workshops. The evaluation team performed the following functions during the project:

1. The Evaluation Team participated with the project staff in modifying and clarifying the objectives.

2. The Evaluation Team developed the framework by which the project could be evaluated.

3. The Evaluation Team served as skilled process observers during the project for the purpose of providing data which could be used as a basis for modifying the project as it progressed as well as gathering data which could be used if the project is continued.

The major sources of evaluation data are documentation reports of all planning and advisory committee meetings, personal observation by the evaluators, feedback to the project staff and evaluators during the workshops, and pre- and post- workshop questionnaires.

The pre- and post- workshop questionnaires were developed by the Evaluation Team from appropriate sections in the original proposal referring to the project objectives. These objectives were clarified, modified and tested with the Planning Committee and the Advisory Committee. The questionnaires were distributed to all participants as one of the preliminary activities and as one of the final workshop activities.

Both questionnaires provided space for participants to express themselves freely with regard to any needs they might have which were not alluded to in the questionnaire as well as to their actual experience in the workshop. Feedback sessions were provided each day to give participants an opportunity to express their reactions and feelings verbally.

The questionnaire was designed to provide quantifiable data along a five-point continuum with respect to specific skills associated with the project objectives. A copy of the questionnaire appears as Appendix E.

The evaluation report from the first year of the project is included here as Appendix F, and the evaluation of the second-year as Appendix G. General conclusions by the evaluators as a result of the entire program are reported below.

General Conclusions (from Evaluators' Final Report)

It appears that in all cases, the project goals were met.

The first objective was to improve the ability of library administrators to meet community demands. The results of the pre- and post- workshop questionnaire, particularly the 1976 Wachusett responses indicates that the project does contribute to the achievement of this goal. It is also apparent that librarians who have not previously been exposed to PPBS and who have a real need for additional budgeting and program evaluation skills gain the most from the simulation.

The second goal of the goal of the project was to upgrade the content and quality of continuing education curricula. For those persons with a real need for additional learning and who are currently employed in libraries there is a gain from participation in the simulation. Students in library school with no experience and with no home situation in which to apply the learnings benefit the least. For a true test with students, however, the game should be modified, tightened up and played with those students who have expressed an interest and who are genuinely interested. It appears, however, that significant learnings took place in the Simmons simulation although it also appeared that it wasn't a particularly enjoyable learning experience.

The third goal of the project was to develop a workshop model which will provide learning opportunities to librarians in the area of program planning and budgeting. The pre- and post- test questionnaires indicate that this goal was achieved. As indicated before, it was most successful with those who had a real need to learn about PPBS and who had a real situation in which to apply their learnings.

The behavioral objectives included participant experience in preparing a program budget; ability to list elements involved in decision-making; ability to describe how some components of a community influence budgetary decisions; the learning of skills of negotiation, compromise and collaboration including trade-offs and the ability to describe elements of program planning. The pre- and post- test questionnaires as well as observation and feedback indicate that these objectives were achieved.

In general the simulation has been found to be an effective learning model for teaching the principles of program planning and budgeting.

APPENDIX A

ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND PROJECT STAFF

Advisory Committee - First Year

Peter Boyer	Town Hall, Elm Street, Southbridge, MA (Town Manager)
Marion Everett	Hubbardston Public Library, Hubbardston, MA, (Head Librarian)
Norma Haynes	Hudson Public Library, Hudson, MA, (Head Librarian)
Christine Kardolas	Worcester Public Library, Worcester, MA, (Head of Branches and Extension)
William Kennedy	Town Hall, Main Street, Holden, MA, (Town Manager)
Jane Peck	Worcester Public Library, (Supervisor of Humanities Dept.)
John Ramsay	Ritter Memorial Library, Lunenburg, MA (Head Librarian)
George Walker	135 Central Street, Auburn, MA, (Trustee)
Elizabeth Watson	Fitchburg Public Library, Fitchburg, MA (Head of Youth Services)

Advisory Committee - Second Year

Peter Boyer	Town Hall, Elm Street, Southbridge, MA, (Town Manager)
Ray Debuse	Worcester State College, Worcester, MA (WACL Coordinator)
Norma Haynes	Hudson Public Library, Hudson, MA, (Head Librarian)
Christine Kardokas	Worcester Public Library, Worcester, MA, (Head of Branches and Extension)
Veronica Marzilli	Worcester Public Library, Worcester, MA, (Library Science Student)
Jane Peck	Worcester Public Library, Worcester, MA, (Supervisor of Humanities Dept.)
Bruce Plummer	Worcester State College, Worcester, MA, (Head of Media)
Elizabeth Watson	Fitchburg Public Library, Fitchburg, MA, (Head of Youth Services)
Eleanor Whitcomb	Lunenburg Elementary School, Lunenburg, MA (School Librarian)

Project Staff

Project Director
Barbara F. Weaver, Worcester Public Library, Worcester, MA

Model Development
Barry Lawson, Harvard, MA
Nancy Reifenstein, Harvard, MA
Juliet Sanger, Harvard, MA

Evaluation
Eleanor Arthur, Bedford, MA
Marcia Lowell, Framingham, MA

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANTS - WORKSHOP AT MT. WACHUSETT COMMUNITY COLLEGE - SPRING 1975

Participants	Library	Position
Cynthia Baird	Leicester Public Library	Head Librarian
Beverley Camp	Stevens Public Library, Ashburnham	Head Librarian
Natalie Cramer	Shrewsbury Public Library	Sr. Library Asst.
Janet Celluci	Hudson Public Library	Assistant Librarian
Claire Eaton	Boylston Public Library	Head Librarian
Marion Everett	Hubbardston Public Library	Head Librarian
Anne Giblin	Worcester Public Library	Branch Librarian
Lois Greenwood	Winchendon Public Library	Treasurer, Board of Trustees
Leslie Harvey	Bolton Public Library	Head Librarian
Delight Haines	Petersham Memorial Library	Head Librarian
Janice Hight	Northboro Public Library	Chairman, Board of Trustees
Bob Hull	Leominster Public Library	Adult Services Head
Christine Kardokas	Worcester Public Library	Head of Branch and Extension Services
Barbara King	Jacob Edwards Library, Southbridge	Head Librarian
Irene Mattila	Westminster Public Library	Assistant Librarian
Bonnie O'Brien	Worcester Public Library	Branch Coordinator
Geraldine Page	Hubbardston Public Library	Chairman, Board of Trustees
Kathleen Peterson	Gale Free Library, Holden	Library Assistant
Helen Pierce	Berlin Public Library	Head Librarian
Susan Therriault	Millbury Public Library	Head Librarian
Frances Turner	Levi Heywood Memorial Library, Gardner	Assistant Librarian

Participant/Guests		
Arlene Hope	Program Officer	U.S. Office of Education, Boston
Howard Lowell	Senior Specialist	Bureau of Library Extension, Boston
Joseph S. Hopkins	Head Librarian	Worcester Public Library

APPENDIX C

CENTRAL MASS. LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION SIMULATION PROJECT

Participants

January 26, 1976 Session - Northborough Free Library, Northborough, Mass.

Bruce Baker	Western Mass. Regional System, Springfield
Glenn Coffman	Westwood Public Library
John Cronin	Bureau of Library Extension, Boston
Adrienne Dorfman	Northborough Public Library
Karen Dorval	Springfield Public Library
Mike Dygert	Eastern Mass. Regional System, Boston
Jane Eastman	Watertown Public Library
Chuck Flaherty	Framingham Public Library
Susan Schleigh Foote	Adams Library, Chelmsford
Stella Frimmel	Watertown Public Library
Diane Gies	Melrose Public Library
Jeanne Hill	Norfolk Public Library
Malcolm Hill	Haverhill Public Library
Sharon Lawrence	Bedford Public Library
Robert Loud	Concord Public Library
Jean McIntyre	Robbins Library, Arlington
Claudia Morner	Osterville Free Library
Mark Nesse	Beverly Public Library
Joan Nethercott	Springfield City Library
Ruth Olson	Plymouth Public Library
Barbara Pettus	Memorial Hall Library, Andover
Donna Polhamus	Cambridge Public Library
Paula Polk	Wilbraham Public Library
Sally Rueter	Wilmington Memorial Library
Ann Smith	Winchester Public Library
Anthony Tieuli	Malden Public Library
Margo Trumpeter	Lucius Beebe Memorial Library, Wakefield
Maralyn Zion	Revere Public Library, Revere

APPENDIX D

Participants - Workshop for Worcester Area Cooperating Libraries

Penny Mattern	Librarian	Worcester Art Museum
Bruce Plummer	Associate Director	Learning Resources Center, Worcester State College
Philippe Poisson	Librarian	Assumption College
Joseph Poire	Librarian	Becker Junior College
Dorothy Brantley	Head of Popular Services	Worcester Public Library

APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

The following list reflects the types of skills that were considered in designing the CLASP Project. Please check the most appropriate response, based on your judgment of the skills you now possess.

SKILLS	I HAVE
1. Skills in the program planning and budgeting process The ability to work through a problem-solving process and to develop a budget which bears specific program relationships.	A high level of skill Many skills Some skills Few skills No skills
2. Skills of decision-making The ability to set priorities, make and modify decisions as a result of new information based on changing community demands.	A high level of skill Many skills Some skills Few skills No skills
3. Skills of negotiation The ability to effectively transmit and receive ideas with others, individually and in groups and the ability to present a proposal to superiors or approval bodies (e.g. trustees, finance committees) to sell a budget and the ability to persuade and negotiate for such approval.	A high level of skill Many skills Some skills Few skills No skills
4. Skills of compromise The ability to revise and modify your proposed budget by involving members of groups affected.	A high level of skill Many skills Some skills Few skills No skills

5. Please list other learning objectives and/or skills which you would like to see addressed in the workshop.

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX F

EVALUATION OF PROJECT - FIRST YEAR

A team of two evaluators was engaged to evaluate both the overall project and the effectiveness of the model as it was tested during the four-day workshop series. The evaluation team performed the following functions during the project:

1. The Evaluation Team participated with the project staff in modifying and clarifying the objectives.

2. The Evaluation Team developed the framework by which the project could be evaluated.

3. The Evaluation Team served as skilled process observers during the project for the purpose of providing data which could be used as a basis for modifying the project as it progressed as well as gathering data which could be used if the project is continued.

The major sources of evaluation data are documentation reports of all planning and advisory committee meetings, personal observation by the evaluators, feedback to the project staff and evaluators during the workshop, and pre- and post- workshop questionnaires.

The pre- and post- workshop questionnaires were developed by the Evaluation Team from appropriate sections in the original proposal referring to the project objectives. These objectives were clarified, modified and tested with the Planning Committee and the Advisory Committee. The questionnaires were distributed to all participants as one of the preliminary activities and as one of the final workshop activities. The response rate was 100% for the pre-test and only 57% for the post-test.

Both questionnaires provided space for participants to express themselves freely with regard to any needs they might have which were not alluded to in the questionnaire as well as to their actual experience in the workshop. Feedback sessions were provided each day to give participants an opportunity to express their reactions and feelings verbally.

The questionnaire was designed to provide quantifiable data along a five-point continuum with respect to specific skills associated with the project objectives. A copy of the questionnaire appears as Appendix E.

Evaluation Methodology

Two evaluation methodologies were integrated and used by the Evaluation Team in evaluating CLASP, the CIPP (Context-Input-Process-Product) model and a model adapted from Scriven which refers to formative (process) and summative (product) evaluation.

The Scriven model emphasizes the distinction between formative (process) and summative (product) evaluation. In formative evaluation, the data is used to make judgments about what works about specific aspects of the on-going program. Summative evaluation is an assessment of the entire program, and thus may call for a completely different set of criteria for evaluation.[1]

[1]Scriven, Michael, The Methodology of Evaluation. AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, No. 1, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1967, p. 10.

The CIPP model developed at Ohio State University[2], defines four types of decisions which must be made during any meaningful cycle of project planning and implementation. These are planning decisions which determine objectives and set priorities; structuring decisions which project strategies for the achievement of those objectives; implementing decisions which are involved in executing the designs; and recycling decisions whereby achievements are measured against objectives and a determination is made whether to continue, modify or terminate a project.

The CIPP evaluation model makes provisions for obtaining evaluative data about each of the four types of decisions. Context Evaluation is the examination of planning decisions which specify major changes that are needed in a program. Planning decisions are of fundamental importance to any program and appropriate evaluation mechanisms should be maintained to provide information for the formulation of new objectives or the modification of existing ones. The Evaluation Team met with the staff and contributed to the refinement of the objectives and the change of program emphasis.

Input Evaluation is the examination of structuring decisions made about methods, content, organization, personnel, schedule, facilities and budget. They are the means to achieve the ends which have been established as a result of planning decisions.

Process Evaluation is the examination of implementing decisions which involve many choices regarding changes of ongoing procedures. The making and executing of implementing decisions comprise much of the responsibility of the program. Observations were made by a member of the Evaluation Team at each of the sessions. In addition, feedback from the participants, as well as process observations by the evaluators provided immediate feedback and suggestions as well as data for use in future simulations.

Product Evaluation is the examination of recycling decisions which are applied to determine the relation of attainments to objectives and to determine whether to continue, terminate or modify an activity. Product evaluation was based on data gathered through participant questionnaires and personal observation by members of the Evaluation Team. The criteria against which output evaluation was measured was contained in the objectives of the project as originally developed and modified in Planning Committee and Advisory Committee meetings.

Evaluation - Model and Results

(1) Context Evaluation - Contextual decisions are those that relate to the needs, setting goals and objectives and developing criteria for assessing performance. The data sources for contextual decision evaluation included the needs and assumptions around which the original proposal was based and the testing of those objectives with the planning and advisory committees.

The original proposal was based on a number of needs assumptions as follows:

a. The modern librarian must be prepared for a set of unique demands as well as opportunities.
b. Librarians accustomed to dealing with middle-class, educated clientele are forced into difficult positions when required to decide on priorities.

[2]Thompson, David D. ed. Planning and Evaluation for Statewide Library Development: New Directions. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1972.

c. Essential that librarians have an awareness of both the community and the administrative system in developing annual programs and budget.
d. Training programs for librarians particularly in rural areas are insufficient to develop an awareness.
e. Recurring problem for educators is the lack of pedagogical tools, models and curricula to address these challenges successfully.
f. PPBS can serve as a basis for innovative curriculum approaches.
g. There is substantial promise for the development of an integrative model of library service in the community based on PPBS.
h. Advantages of the simulation approach
   (1) simplifying complex administrative and social systems
   (2) provide an opportunity to learn-by-doing
   (3) exploit role-playing simulations' uniqueness as an enjoyable medium for learning

These needs assumptions were tested both with the Planning and Advisory Committees. The Evaluators helped to clarify the objectives based on these needs and to develop the behavioral objectives against which the project would be evaluated. The Advisory Committee, which included persons other than librarians, found these needs to be valid within their own experience.

(2.) Input Evaluation - Input decisions provide information relating to program structure including alternative strategies for implementing program objectives. It also answers who does what - when.

The assumption of the project was that the simulation model offered a fruitful structural model for attaining the objectives. Input from both the Planning and Advisory Committees, therefore, was limited to specific emphasis within the model. The Advisory Committee in the opinion of the Evaluators was extremely helpful in providing a more specific focus for the game director with regard to issues such as communication, cooperation, the library's response to change, the role of the library with relation to financial constraints. In the opinion of the Evaluators, the information generated by the Advisory Committee aided greatly in refining the model.

(3.) Process Evaluation - Process Evaluation is defined as examining the progress of the program with respect to whether or not it is going as planned and whether it needs modification.

Process Observations - Participants seemed cordial and relaxed on arrival helped by the fact that most knew each other.

The skill of the game director was evident as soon as the session was called to order. The introduction was relaxed, good-humored and helpful, with a norm established immediately of feedback in the form of participant questions. Personal style and familiarity with the game was obviously an integral part of the success of the workshop. To test the transferability of the game to other situations, it should be tried with different leadership. (The game director was the person who developed the model.)

The introduction included a rundown of the day's schedule, including the time scheduled for a feedback session helping the participants to see how the program was integrated. Barry provided process interpretations throughout the game and suggested that through a competitive spirit, participants would learn program planning process from one another. Barry's description of the process was as follows: What is our goal? How do we get there? By what criteria will we know when we've succeeded? How will we evaluate what we've done?

A question was raised with the participants early on and repeated on several occasions as to their choice of community roles. Most picked communities with profiles similar to their home community. Opportunities were provided throughout the game to change community roles but no one did.

The decision-making process on day one was extremely awkward for the Regional meeting. Barry offered suggestions of alternative decision-making processess, but the group never made a decision on the process they would use. By default, voting became the process used which remained the same throughout the game. One participant registered a complaint to the Regional meeting that the options were not presented adequately prior to the vote.

It took some time, also for the Regional people to develop a strategy on their relationship to member libraries. By the third day they divided the tasks among the role's participants and observed certain libraries' activities for community needs. Participants felt the role of regional staff needed more clarification as well as more delineation of the regional program. They asked for a regional profile similar to that provided for the libraries, as well as a game board for the region.

The regional meetings debated program priorities on days one and two but on day three stayed with the previous day's decision-making. A question was raised about the process of decision-making and whether or not there should be some kind of proportional representation since the large city pays more but doesn't necessarily use more services.

Feedback - During the feedback sessions at the end of each day comments were made by the participants regarding both the content of the game as well as the process.

The game was structured so that libraries were competing with one another with the community finance board. Most participants felt that it was unrealistic in pitting one library against another at the local level. Librarians playing trustees, and trustees playing librarians, however, got a real feeling for each other's problems and how each is perceived by the other.

Since there were many librarians participating from very small towns, many felt that the level and sophistication of the program planning and budgeting process was unrealistic for them. Many also felt that more learning would have taken place if participants had played roles different from those at home.

Participants saw as the purpose of the experience consciousness raising about program budgets. Participants found value in interaction with other participants and learned to think in terms of client demands and got an understanding of long-range planning, evaluation of services and learned new ways to defend their budgets.

Participants felt that the experience was richer because of their own experience, although some expressed a wish that graduate schools had taught this way and that they had had an experience like this earlier in their careers.

Conclusions - The Evaluators felt that the program went as planned. The game provided a rich learning experience for the participants. Modifications suggested by the participants, although not immediately introduced, because of the time constraints in recalibrating a simulation, will be suggested as refinements to the model for the next simulation.

(4.) Product Evaluation - Product Evaluation is the report of the project results, whether or not the objectives of the project were reached, what modifications were discovered that would result in new objectives being developed and whether the

findings are transferable. Data used for product evaluation include the pre- and post- workshop questionnaire, the project objectives, the last day feedback session and the follow-up planning and advisory committee meetings.

Four questions were used in the pre- and post- workshop questionnaire reflecting the kinds of skill related to the objectives. These included skills of program planning and budgeting, decision-making, negotiation and compromise. Because only 57% of the post- workshop questionnaires were returned comparisons will be made on a percentage basis only.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1. Skills of PPBS		
High	1	-
Many	3	6
Some	6	5
Few	8	1
No	2	-
2. Skills of decision-making		
High	1	1
Many	6	7
Some	10	5
Few	4	-
No	-	-
3. Skills of negotiation		
High	3	5
Many	2	3
Some	9	2
Few	7	2
No	-	-
4. Skills of compromise		
High	-	-
Many	7	6
Some	3	4
Few	6	-
No	4	2

Question one was designed to assess the skill level of participants with regard to program planning and budgeting. Elements of program planning and budgeting were defined as the ability to work through a problem-solving process and to develop a budget which bears specific program relationships. Percentage comparisons of participants' perceptions of their skill levels are as follows:

	Pre	Post
High	5%	-
Many	15	50%
Some	30	41
Few	40	8
No	10	-

The pre-test reveals that approximately 50% of the respondents felt that they had few or no skills in program budgeting while 50% felt they had some, many or high skills. The post-test reveals that as a result of the workshop, 91% of the respondents had some or many skills where only 8% had few skills while no one felt they no skills.

Question two was designed to assess the skills participants felt they had with regard to decision-making. Decision-making was defined as the ability to set priorities, make and modify decisions as a result of new information based on changing community demands.

	Pre	Post
High	4%	7%
Many	29	53.8
Some	48	38.4
Few	19	-
No	-	-

The pre-test reveals that 33% of the participants felt they had high or many skills in decision making whereas 60.8% of the respondents in the post-test felt they had high or many skills. 48% of the respondents in the pre-test felt they had some skills while 38% felt they had some skills as revealed in the post-test. In the post-test no one felt that they had either few or no skills.

Question three asked participants to indicate their perceived level of skill with regard to negotiation. Negotiation was defined as the ability to effectively transmit and receive ideas with others, individually and in groups and the ability to present a proposal to superiors or approval bodies (e.g. trustees or finance committees), to sell a budget and the ability to persuade and negotiate for such approval.

High	14%	41.6
Many	9.5	25
Some	42	16.6
Few	33	16.6
No	-	-

The pre-test reveals that 14% of the respondents felt that they had a high level of negotiating skill while as a result of the workshop 41.6% of the participants felt that they had a high level. In contrast, the pre-test showed 33% feeling they had few skills while 16.6% of post-test felt they had few skills.

Question four asked participants to indicate their skill level with respect to compromise. Compromise was defined as the ability to revise and modify a proposed budget by involving members of groups affected.

High	-	-
Many	35%	50%
Some	15	33.3
Few	30	-
No	20	16.6

Both pre- and post- tests revealed that none of the participants felt a high level of skills of compromise. 35% of the pre-test respondents indicated they had many skills while 50% of the post-test respondents so indicated. 20% of the pre-test respondents while 16.6% of the post-test respondents felt they had no skills.

The fifth question asked participants to list other learning objectives and/or skills they would like to improve on. The responses on the pre-test indicated that participants wished to learn more about how to assess community needs, how to set priorities, skills in personnel development to reflect changing programs and budgets and in one case how to persuade the trustees that the librarians should be involved in the budgeting process.

The post-test responses to question five centered around skills participants would like to have had emphasized during the workshop, as well as suggestions of ways to improve the game. Some participants wished for more emphasis on the skills of involving library boards as well as a better role within the game for the finance committee.

For some participants, the game introduced them to a new way of thinking about budgets, the role of state and federal agencies and the general question of accountability on the local as well as state and federal level. Some would like to play the game again.

The following is an assessment by the evaluators of whether or not the project objectives were met and why.

The first objective of the project was to improve the ability of library administrators to meet community demands. The assumption here is that by learning better skills of program budgeting based on the needs of the community the librarian will be better able to meet community demands.

The results of the pre- and post- workshop questionnaire indicates that many participants felt that their skills of program planning and budgeting, decision-making, negotiation and compromise had improved.

During the feedback sessions, participants indicated that they had been exposed to a new way of thinking and had gotten a handle or tool with which to examine their own library program and budget priorities.

The evaluators feel that in general, the project met its goal of improving the ability of administrators to meet community demands.

The second goal of the project was to upgrade the content and quality of continuing education curricula.

Many participants had limited experience with continuing education other than one-day workshops conducted within the region on specific issues relating to librarianship. No one in the group had ever experienced a simulation before. Participant reaction and feedback was generally positive but because their experience is limited it is hard to generalize about how well this objective has been met. The Evaluators feel that with second-year funding for the project now assured that further data will become available to test this objective.

The third goal of the project was to develop a workshop model which will provide learning opportunities to librarians in the area of program planning and budgeting.

Much of the feedback particularly the last day revealed participants' comfort with the model. The comments revealed that for many the experience provided a relaxed and a more open way to learn, more understanding about client demands as they relate to program budgeting. Additional comments to the staff, evaluators and the post-workshop questionnaire revealed that the participants perceived that they had learned a great deal and were convinced that the role-playing model provided a rich and enjoyable way of learning.

The evaluators concluded that the project met its third objective.

Behavioral objectives related to the above objectives included:

1. Participants will have some experience in how a program budget is prepared.

The evaluators concluded that this objective was met. Data in support of this conclusion includes participant level of involvement in the play of the game as observed by the evaluators and feedback.

2. Participants will be able to list some elements involved in decision-making.

The pre- and post- workshop questionnaire showed that participants to some degree feel that their skills of decision-making have improved. The evaluators intend to further test this objective with a follow-up questionnaire to the participants which will measure long-range impact of the workshop.

3. Participants will be able to describe verbally their new awareness of how community components influence budgetary decisions.

Participants have been able to describe verbally their new awareness of how community components influence decision-making.

The evaluators conclude that this objective has been met.

4. Participants will have learned some skills of negotiation, compromise, and collaboration including trade-offs (the political process).

The evaluators conclude that the pre- and post- workshop questionnaires indicate that participants have learned some new skills in this area. Verbal feedback indicated that participants have also learned more precise definitions of the terms indicating to the evaluators an over-optimism in assessing skills in the pre-test.

5. Participants will be able to describe the elements of program planning.

It is anticipated that this objective will be further tested in the follow-up questionnaire. However, feedback indicated that few if any participants would be able to list elements of program planning. The evaluators conclude, therefore, that this objective was not met although admitting that hard data is lacking at this time.

The foregoing was reported by the evaluation team as its official observations of the project. In addition, there were a number of aspects of the project that provided input for future improvement of the model. Some of the most significant of these are highlighted below, and will be the subject of planned revision for subsequent reruns and tests of the CLASP model.

One oversight in the workshop model was the omission of more formal procedures for the operations of the simulated regional library system. It was clear from the beginning of the exercise that more attention to the details of its program development process and its available resources would have facilitated the participants' identification process.

Second, the learning process may well been enhanced for all the participants if the selection of roles for individual participants had been done on a random basis. In the workshop each participant was given a choice of the hypothetical library he/she wished to work in. Many selected a library whose characteristics resembled their real-life situation. While this had some advantages in terms of facilitating role identification, the designers felt that it also inhibited several participants from attempting "new" strategies or thoroughly challenging the opportunities afforded by the simulation. Several librarians had resources to work with which were too similar to those to which they were accustomed. Having fewer (or more) resources than in real life might have encouraged low-risk experimentation to a greater degree during the simulation.

One of the more rewarding surprises was the degree to which the participants developed innovative responses to the client demands presented to them. Each card presented a situation to which a response was required. Three to four possible responses were provided in a multiple choice format to the librarians along with an open option simply called "other". Because of the years of experience of the average participant in addressing similar demands, a wide variety of good responses were made, utilizing the open-ended option more often than had been anticipated. Whether this observations would be repeated in a run of the model with library science students, awaits testing with such a group. The conclusion, however, for the designer is that as much flexibility as possible should be allowed in the model for participants' responses influenced by their level of experience.

A similar point is raised when evaluating the program and budget formulation stages of the simulation. While most of the participants had little real-life experience in budget preparation, most had some experience in putting a program into operation. For such a group, one possible modification in the simulation would be to increase the opportunity for innovation in the design of programs, while maintaining necessary constraints on parameters such as program cost and the use of other resources to maintain a format needed for accounting player actions and permitting feedback necessary for PPBS development and play evaluation.

With respect to the PPBS aspect of the simulation, it was clear that more pressure should have been placed on participants to prepare a program budget and to develop performance measures for self-evaluations of their selected programs. While participants were taken through the rudiments of such an exercise, insufficient attention was paid to learning-through-doing in this portion of the simulation. Improvements can also be made in the process of reviewing prepared annual budgets. The system of the players reviewing the budget submissions and defenses of their peers provided ample opportunity for negotiation and compromise experience. Unrealistically, however, the compromises made were most often trade-offs among programs of competing libraries rather than compromises among different departments of municipal government. It is now felt that a redesign of this portion of CLASP could provide a more realistic field of battle for the participant.

Contrary to original model design objectives, little use was made of the geographical features of the six "towns" displayed on the playing surface in front of each role (in roughly a scale of 1"=800'). Two kinds of issues which could be utilized more thoroughly as the model evolves are those related directly to the physical development of a town (e.g., new industrial development, the construction of new schools, highways, etc.) and the possible expansion of old (or construction of new) facilities for the municipal library itself. This emphasis on the board would permit more serious consideration of the relationship between community development and the formulation of library goals and objectives.

The above are only the most obvious of the areas where additional attention must be focused as the CLASP model evolves. Projected testing with several different user groups will provide opportunities to try design modifications and will likely bring to the surface other areas where improvements can and should be made. Despite the room which necessarily exists for these improvements, a model now exists which combines the aspects of meeting community demands, preparing and justifying program and budget requests, and evaluating critically program success in a strictly training environment which is both open and entertaining for public library officials and students.

Among the next steps is continuing model refinement and testing in the interests of developing a training simulation which can meet the needs of various groups related to the field of library science and which has the flexibility to be easily administered by this variety of groups.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As the project progressed, it became obvious that the people who were attracted to participating in the exercise were people who were already involved to some extent in an administrative role within their libraries, and people who were already motivated to learn. If the model is to be usable as a primary educational tool for practicing librarians, it will have to be revised so that it will appeal to a broader group, and so that the effect, however beneficial, of the workshop leader will be minimized.

For these reasons, a second-year of the model development and testing is planned, to include refinement and condensation of the exercises, testing in several different library environments and finally, a pilot test using practicing librarians as workshop leaders to determine how extensive a set of operating instructions is necessary.

It is hoped that a packageable product will result from the second-year effort, although an actual package in sufficient quantity for wide distribution is not possible within financial constraints of the project. In addition to the press releases and technical article to be written concerning the project, it is also planned to conduct a demonstration session of the model, hopefully at a major convention such as that of the American Library Association to give an opportunity for library personnel nationwide to see the results of the project and assess its usefulness for their home situation.

APPENDIX G

CLASP EVALUATION, 1976

I. RECAP OF PROJECT

The CLASP project as originally developed, had the following goals:

1. General Goals and Objectives

To improve the ability of library administrators to meet community demands;

To upgrade the content and quality of continuing education curricula;

To develop a workshop model that will provide learning opportunities to librarians in the area of program planning and budgeting.

2. Behavioral objectives

Participants will have some experience in how a program budget is developed;

Participants will be able to list some elements involved in decision-making;

Participants will be able to describe how some components of a community influence budgetary decisions;

Participants will have learned some skills of negotiation, compromise and collaboration including trade-offs (the political process);

Participants will be able to describe the elements of program planning.

These objectives, developed for the first year of the project, were continued as the project moved into the second year.

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The Evaluation in the second year, as in the first year, included the CIPP and Scriven models of evaluation. The CIPP model consists of four parts.

CONTEXT evaluation -- the examination of planning decisions;

INPUT evaluation -- the examination of structuring decisions;

PROCESS evaluation -- the examination of implementing decisions;

PRODUCT evaluation -- the examination of recycling decisions which are used to determine whether the goals set have been attained.

The Scriven model of evaluation distinguishes between formative (process) and summative (product) evaluation.

In the second year of the project, the major evaluation effort concerned the process and product components of the CIPP model.

III. EVALUATION

1. Scope of the Evaluation Program

The CLASP events in the second year of the project were essentially three. A one-day simulation at the Northborough Public Library which included public librarian participants from the Eastern Mass. Regional System area, four two-hour

sessions at Simmons College with library science student participants from an adult services class and a one-day simulation at Worcester State College with participants from an adult services class and a one-day simulation at Worcester State College with participants from academic and special libraries in the Worcester area.

2. Data Sources
The three major sources of data for evaluation were pre- and post- workshop questionnaires and observation and feedback during the workshops.

3. Participant Selection Criteria
The participants in the workshop in Northboro were middle managers in public libraries from Eastern Massachusetts who were suggested by the EMRLS administrator.

The adult services class at Simmons was volunteered by Professor A.J. Anderson who had an interest in the project.

The participants at Worcester State College included academic and special librarians from the Worcester Area Cooperating Libraries (WACL) who were interested.

4. Pre- and Post- Workshop Questionnaire - Format and Procedure
The pre- and post- workshop questionnaire was the same questionnaire used in the first year of the project in order that there be some comparability.

The questionnaire was designed to provide quantifiable data along a five-point continuum with respect to specific skills associated with the project objectives.

In addition, the questionnaire provided space for participants to express themselves freely with regard to any needs they might have had as well as their actual experience in the workshop. Feedback sessions were provided to give participants an opportunity to express their reactions and feelings verbally.

5. Evaluation - Model and Results
Since context and input evaluation refer specifically to the development of the project, no specific mention of those components of evaluation will be made here. Instead the focus in the second-year of the project will be on process and product evaluation.

(1.) Process Evaluation

Process evaluation is defined as examining the progress of the program with respect to whether or not it is going as planned and whether it needs modification.

The Model The CLASP Model is a role-playing simulation which capitalizes on the advantages of game play and post-game review and disucssion. Libraries set in hypothetical communities in a region are the stage for play. Groups of participants assume the role of librarians. Each participant usually will have the opportunity to serve as advisor to a regional library system and community budget decision-making board.

In the process of play, all are to test both their luck and skill in anticipating community demands on their libraries; news events which may or may not affect its services; developing and defending budget requests and preparing and evaluating a program plan for library service. Play consists of rounds, corresponding to years.

The game represents an introduction to the concept of program planning and budgeting emphasizing practical application which is transferable to real world circumstances.

Process Observations - Northboro Even though it was a bad day, most people were there on time. The project director, Barbara Weaver, introduced the project game director, Barry Lawson, who immediately explained the game and objectives of the simulation.

The participants, without exception, participated whole-heartedly in the day's activities and most appeared comfortable and relaxed, asked questions and challenged Barry's authority as game director. Most of the participants knew one another which added greatly to the air of informality.

Feedback - Northboro Because the session was only for one day, some of the activities were compressed or eliminated. The elimination of the program cost analysis was felt by the participants to be a major drawback to the one-day workshop. Many of the participants were from large libraries and were more interested in the program evaluation and budgeting aspects than they were in the program development side.

Conclusions - Northboro The evaluator felt that the program went well but that a one-day simulation unless the need was specifically program development was not sufficient. A one and one-half day simulation would provide more time to go through the entire program - planning - budgeting - analysis sequence.

(2.) Product Evaluation

Product Evaluation is the report of the project results, whether or not the objectives of the project were reached, what modifications were discovered that would result in new objectives and whether the findings are transferable. Data used for product evaluation include the pre- and post- workshop questionnaire, the project objectives and the last feedback session.

Pre- and Post- Workshop Questionnaire - Northboro Four questions were used in the pre- and post- workshop questionnaire reflecting the kinds of skills related to the objectives. These included skills of program planning and budgeting, decision-making, negotiation and compromise. Comparisons will be made on a percentage basis only.

	Pre-Test/	%	Post-Test/	%
1. Skills of PPBS				
High	-	-	1	5%
Many	2	8%	10	45%
Some	16	61%	11	50%
Few	7	26%	-	-
No	1	4%	-	-

Question one was designed to assess the skill level of participants with regard to program planning and budgeting. Elements of program planning and budgeting were defined as the ability to work through a problem-solving process and to develop a budget which bears specific program relationships. The pre-test reveals that approximately 30% of the respondents felt they had few or no skills in PPBS while a majority or 61% felt they had some, only 8% felt they had many skills. The post-test reveals that 5% felt they had high skills, 45% felt they had many skills while 50% felt they some skills.

	Pre-test/%		Post-test/%	
2. Skills of decision-making				
High	1	4%	3	14%
Many	6	23%	13	59%
Some	17	65%	6	27%
Few	2	8%	-	-
No	-	-	-	-

Question two was designed to assess the skills participants felt they had with regard to decision-making. Decision-making was defined as the ability to set priorities, make and modify decisions as a result of new information based on changing community demands. The pre-test reveals that most participants felt they had some or few skills in decision-making while only 23% felt they had many skills and only 4% felt they had high skills. The post test showed that 14% had high skills, whole fully 59% felt they had many skills and 27% felt they had some.

3. Skills of negotiation				
High	-	-	3	14%
Many	7	26%	10	45%
Some	17	65%	9	41%
Few	1	4%	-	-
No	1	4%	-	-

Question three asked participants to indicate their perceived level of skill with regard to negotiation. Negotiation was defined as the ability to effectively transmit and receive ideas with others, individually and in groups and the ability to present a proposal to superiors or approval bodies, to sell a budget and the ability to persuade and negotiate for such approval. The pre-test revealed that most participants felt they had a high level of skill in negotiation - 26% felt they had many skills while 56% felt they had some. The post-test saw 14% with a high level with 45% having many skills and 41% having some.

4. Skills of compromise				
High	-	-	1	5%
Many	8	30%	14	64%
Some	14	54%	7	31%
Few	3	12%	-	-
No	1	4%	-	-

Question four asked participants to indicate their skill level with respect to compromise. Compromise was defined as the ability to revise and modify a proposed budget by involving members of groups affected. The pre-test showed that 70% of the participants had some few or no skills while 30% had some. The post-test, however, showed 71% having many or high skills and 31% having some.

The fifth question asked participants to list other learning objectives and/or skills they would like to improve on. There were no responses in either the pre- or post-test.

(3.) Process Observations - Simmons

The participants at Simmons College were the students in the Adult Services course taught by Prof. A.J. Anderson who had volunteered the class as participants. The fact that the students were not participating freely greatly influenced the manner and the outcome of the game. Many of the participants did not enjoy the game -- many skipped one or more of the sessions. The project team, because no name tags were worn, were unable to connect up in a personal way with any of the participants. There was a great deal of private "bitching" about the game but participants did not feel comfortable in sharing their views with the project team.

Most of the participants tolerated the game and while were not actively or noticeable enthusiastic, nevertheless were not noticeable hostile. Most of the students were young with little or experience in libraries. Those students without library experience found the game to be unrealistic and dull. Those with some experience, however, were those who found the game more interesting and realistic.

During the simulation, game leaders other than the project developer conducted sessions. Both leaders, one a former participant and the other the project director, experienced little difficulty in leading the sessions.

Pre- and Post-Workshop Questionnaire - Simmons

1. Skills of PPBS	Pre-test/%		Post-test/%	
High	-	-	-	-
Many	1	4%	2	9%
Some	6	21%	17	77%
Few	13	46%	3	14%
No	8	29%		-

The pre-test reveals that 96% of the participants felt they had some, few or no skills while in the post-test 86% of the participants felt they they had some or many of the skills.

2. Skills of decision-making				
High	-	-	2	9%
Many	3	11%	3	14%
Some	13	46%	16	73%
Few	9	32%	-	-
No	3	11%	1	4%

Again the pre-test reveals 89% of the participants on the low side of the scale or from some to no skills. The post-test also shows some gain with 96% of the participants from some up to high level of skills.

3. Skills of negotiation				
High	-	-	1	4%
Many	-	-	-	-
Some	10	36%	17	77%
Few	12	43%	4	18%
No	6	21%	-	-

The pre-test here reveals that participants generally split from some down to no skills while in the post-test the percentage in the some category increased and there were no participants who indicated no skills.

4. Skills of compromise				
High	-	-	1	4%
Many	-	-	2	9%
Some	10	36%	16	73%
Few	10	36%	2	9%
No	8	28%	1	4%

Again, the pre-test reveals most of the participants clustered from some to no skills in a pretty even split while the post-test reveals a perfect bell-curve with 73% of the participants in the middle indicating some skills.

The fifth question in the pre-test received two responses; one was a hope that by playing the game the participant could understand the channels of power and the other was the effects of budgeting moves. The post-test responses to question five were quite rich with implications for the workshop particularly for student groups. The students wanted less emphasis on game-playing and more on decision-making, how to do actual program planning, to some the workshop was a waste of time, too unrealistic, offered few alternatives and little motivation to listen to other groups and offered the same boring, repetitious procedures and questions. Some felt that the workshop should have consisted of three sessions instead of four.

(4.) Process Observations - Worcester State College

The participants in the academic simulation included academic and special librarians from the Worcester area as well as the project director and the project evaluator. The group was small, most knew one another and the interaction was friendly and informal from the beginning.

Barry, as usual, introduced the game, explained the process and outlined the modifications in the game occasioned by an academic library setting.

Because of the extensive library experience of most of the participants, many comments were made throughout the day regarding the game's applicability to an academic library setting and the relevance of the game's demands as well as the suggested action alternatives.

All seemed to enjoy playing the game and found it a useful method of learning more about program planning and budgeting, while at the same time expressing some dissatisfaction with the game's relative inflexibility.

Pre- and Post- Workshop Questionnaire - Worcester State

1. Skills of PPBS	Pre-test/%		Post-test/%	
High	-	-	-	-
Many	-	-	1	16%
Some	4	80%	4	68%
Few	-	-	1	18%
No	1	20%	-	-

The pre-test showed that 80% of the participants felt they had some skills while 20% felt they had no skills. The post-test showed 16% with many skills, 68% with some skills and 16% with few skills.

2. Skills of decision-making				
High	-	-	-	-
Many	1	20%	3	50%
Some	3	60%	2	34%
Few	-	-	1	16%
No	1	20%	-	-

The pre- and post-test do not differ substantially except that in the pre-test 20% felt they had no skills while no one in the post-test felt they had no skills.

3. Skills of negotiation	Pre-test/%		Post-test/%	
High	-	-	-	-
Many	1	20%	2	34%
Some	2	40%	3	50%
Few	1	20%	1	16%
No	1	20%	-	-

The pre-test showed that most or 40% of participants felt they had some skills with 20% having many skills. The post-test showed that 50% felt they had some skills and 34% felt they had many skills and no one had no skills.

4. Skills of compromise				
High	-	-	1	17%
Many	2	40%	1	17%
Some	2	40%	3	50%
Few	-	-	-	-
No	1	20%	1	16%

The pre-test in this instance resembles very closely the post-test with the sole exception of the post-test participant who moved from some skills to many.

The fifth question was responded to on the pre-test by one participant indicating an interest in skills of negotiation concerning staff priorities. The post-test suggestions include asking for an expanded section on budget, program; evaluation, the clarification of relationships, more flexible budgets. One participant characterized the game as reactive, no rewards for real planning and there is need for more decision-making on the part of the participants. One felt that one day wasn't enough time to improve their skills and that the relationship of accreditation to academic libraries should be included. One person felt that the workshop was already useful in introducing one to program budgeting and making one more aware of regional possibilities.

A questionnaire was sent to all the participants in the original simulation held over one year ago at Mt. Wachusett Community College. The intent was to find out if any of the learnings at the workshop had carried over and had been useful in developing annual budgets. The comparisons are as follows:

1. Skills of PPBS	Pre-	Post-	1976
High	5%	-	27%
Many	15%	50%	63%
Some	30%	41%	9%
Few	40%	8%	-
No	10%		-
2. Skills of decision-making			
High	4%	7%	36%
Many	29%	54%	45%
Some	48%	38%	9%
Few	19%	-	-
No	-	-	-
3. Skills of negotiation			
High	14%	42%	18%
Many	10%	25%	45%
Some	42%	16%	36%
Few	33%	16%	-
No	-	-	-

4. Skills of Compromise	Pre-	Post-	1976
High	-	-	18%
Many	35%	50%	45%
Some	15%	34%	36%
Few	30%	-	-
No	20%	16%	-

It appears that the 1976 questionnaire shows in all cases with the possible exception of question 3 that the participants involved sustained and maximized the skills learned in the simulation. Their responses to question five bear this out. To some, the major learning in the simulation was the ability to view the budget in long-range terms and thereby gain the perspective of a long-range planner rather than a day-to-day librarian. Some librarians found that one of the outcomes of the workshop was the ability to understand and work more closely and profitably with trustees and budget officials within the town.

General Conclusions

It appears that in all cases, the project goals were met.

The first objective was to improve the ability to library administrators to meet community demands. The results of the pre- and post- workshop questionnaire, particularly the 1976 Wachusett responses indicates that the project does contribute to the achievement of this goal. It is also apparent that librarians who have not previously been exposed to PPBS and who have a real need for additional budgeting and program evaluation skills gain the most from the simulation.

The second goal of the project was to upgrade the content and quality of continuing education curricula. For those persons with a real need for additional learning and who are currently employed in libraries there is a gain from participation in the simulation. Students in library school with no experience and with no home situation in which to apply the learnings benefit the least. For a true test with students, however, the game should be modified, tightened up and played with those students who have expressed an interest and who are genuinely interested. It appears, however, that significant learnings took place in the Simmons simulation although it also appeared that it wasn't a particularly enjoyable learning experience.

The third goal of the project was to develop a workshop model which will provide learning opportunities to librarians in the area of program planning and budgeting. The pre- and post-test questionnaires indicate that this goal was achieved. As indicated before, it was most successful with those who had a real need to learn about PPBS and who had a real situation in which to apply their learnings.

The behavioral objectives included participant experience in preparing a program budget; ability to list elements involved in decision-making; ability to describe out components of a community influence budgetary decisions; the learning of skills of negotiation, compromise and collaboration including trade-offs and the ability to describe elements of program planning. The pre- and post-test questionnaires as well as observation and feedback indicate that these objectives were achieved.

In general the simulation has been found to be an effective learning model for teaching the principles of program planning and budgeting.

APPENDIX H

The Librarians' Game

The Librarians' Game is included only in those copies of this report that are being submitted to the U.S. Office of Education as part of the reporting requirements of the grant. Others wishing copies of the game should contact Harwell Associates, Pinnacle Road, Harvard, MA 01451.